UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,052	03/31/2004	Jesper Kiehn	M61.12-0615	7946

7590	01/31/2005

John Veldhuis-Kroeze
Westman, Champlin & Kelly
Suite 1600
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER
HOFFMAN, BRANDON S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2136	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/815,052	KIEHN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon Hoffman	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _31 March 2004_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _3/31/04_

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 18, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1).

      Regarding claims 1, 18, and 34, Boozer et al. teaches a

method/system/computer readable medium for providing Resource-Event-Agent (REA)

model based security, the method/system/computer readable medium comprising:

- Identifying an association between a first object and a second object in an REA

  model (page 1, paragraph 0016);

- Creating an association class for the association between the first object and

  second object, the association class defining security between the first object and

  the second object (page 1, paragraph 0018).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2-17, 19-33, and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Boozer et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0205355 A1) in view of Colburn

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,404).

Regarding claims 2, 19, and 35, Boozer et al. teaches all the limitations of claims

1, 18, and 34, respectively, above. However, Boozer et al. does not teach wherein

creating the association class for the association between the first object and the

second object further comprises creating an association class object having properties,

the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first

object and the second object.

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class for the association

between the first object and the second object further comprises creating an association

class object having properties, the properties of the association class object defining the

security between the first object and the second object (col. 6, lines 42-52).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to combine creating an association class object having properties,

the properties of the association class object defining the security between the first

object and the second object, as taught by Colburn et al., with the method/system/

computer readable medium of Boozer et al. It would have been obvious for such

modifications because objects have properties that define the attributes of the object.

The attributes define the object and therefore define the security between the two

objects.

Regarding claims 3, 20, and 36, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class object further comprises

creating one or more association class objects having properties, properties of the one

or more association class objects defining security between a first class of objects of

which the first object is a member and a second class of objects of which the second

object is a member (see col. 6, lines 42-52 of Colburn et al.).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al.

teaches wherein the second object is a securable object (see page 1, paragraph 0018

of Boozer et al., the objects may have security parents).

Regarding claims 5 and 21, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et

al. teaches wherein the first object is of a particular agent type, and wherein a role for a

user is defined by the particular agent type for the first object (see page 6, paragraph

0066 and 0076 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 6-10 and 22-26, official notice is taken that wherein the second

object is a contract or agreement type object, a commitment type object, an event type

object, a resource type object, and an agent type object is an obvious modification to

the method/system/computer readable medium of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the

different object types that are specific to an REA model with the method/system/

computer readable medium of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn et al. because REA is

just one of many modeling methods. Boozer et al. and Colburn et al. use different

modeling methods, but mention different object types. The specific object types of the

claim are particular of REA.

Regarding claims 11, 12, 27, and 28, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein identifying the association between the first object and

the second object further comprises identifying a [control type/custody type] association

between the first object and the second object (see page 1, paragraph 0016 and page

3, paragraph 0033 of Boozer et al., control meaning 'ownership' and custody meaning

'template').

Regarding claims 13 and 29, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn

et al. teaches wherein creating the association class for the association between the

first object and the second object further comprises creating the association class in a

security model (see page 1, paragraph 0016 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 14, 30, and 37, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class in the security model

further comprises creating the association class in the security model separate from the

REA model (see fig. 19, ref. num 1200 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 15, 31, and 38, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein creating the association class in the security model

further comprises creating the association class in the security model as part of the REA

model (see fig. 2 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 16, 32, and 39, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of

Colburn et al. teaches wherein defining security between the first object and the second

object further comprises defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the

second object (see page 2/3, paragraph 0029 of Boozer et al.).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, the combination of Boozer et al. in view of Colburn

et al. teaches wherein defining permissions and rights of the first object relative to the

second object further comprises dynamically determining the permissions and rights in a security policy logic module outside of the security model (see col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 13 of Colburn et al.).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon Hoffman whose telephone number is 571-272-3863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brandon Hoffman

BH

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21